

than at any other time in recent history—Congress cannot get its act together to extend emergency insurance, as we have always done with bipartisan backing for decades.

Well, part of the reason is that many on the other side do not see this as an emergency. They look at a crisis for families' budgets and see an opportunity for their political fortunes. They think when unemployment goes up, so do their poll numbers.

Some even think that the unemployed enjoy being out of work. That is why one of the top Republicans in the Senate called unemployment assistance a "disincentive for them to seek new work" and voted three times in recent weeks against extending it.

Another senior Republican Senator said these Americans—people who want nothing more than to find a new job—"don't want to go look for work." And then he, too, voted "no" three times.

A third senior Republican Senator, who, like his colleagues, has time and again stood in the way of addressing this emergency, justified it by saying—listen to this quote—"We should not be giving cash to people who basically are just going to blow it on drugs." That is a direct quote.

My constituents take offense at these absurd allegations, and they have let me know about it time and time again. They have written or called, sent me e-mails. They have pulled me aside when I have been home to talk to me about this.

One of these e-mails came to me last week from Las Vegas, where unemployment is now 14.5 percent. Statewide it is 14.2 percent. This man's name is Scott Headrick. He wrote me, and you can hear in the e-mail his anger. It is sad. He is one of 2.5 million Americans who, because of Republicans' objections, is no longer getting the unemployment help he needs. This is what Scott Headrick wrote to me:

I've been unemployed since July 2008 and have not been able to obtain a position at a supermarket packing groceries. I've been religiously seeking, searching and applying for work without any luck. I have since left my family in Las Vegas, a wife and five children, to look for work in other states and again, without any luck.

Scott mentioned the Senators making these outrageous claims and demanded that they, in his words: apologize to those Americans truthfully looking for work to support their families. . . . I and my family have already lost everything but each other.

Scott is right. The twisted logic we have seen in the unemployment debate is not just appalling or heartless, though it is certainly both of those things. It is also factually wrong.

First, there is only one open job in America for every five Americans desperate to fill it. So no one should be so crass as to accuse anyone of being unemployed by choice—especially not those same lawmakers whose irresponsible policies over the past decade created the very crisis that collapsed the job market in the first place.

Second, unemployment insurance works. It helps our economy recover. Mark Zandi, who was JOHN MCCAIN's economic adviser when he ran for President, calculated that every time \$1 goes out in unemployment benefits, \$1.61 comes back into the economy. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that number could actually be as high as \$2, meaning we double our investment in helping the unemployed.

If you think about it, it makes sense. Nobody is getting rich off the \$300 unemployment check they get each week. And nobody keeps those checks under his mattress. These Americans turn around and spend the money. They immediately pay their bills, go to the store, keep up with their mortgage payments, which stimulates the economy. They spend it on the basics and bare necessities while they look for work. The money goes right back into the economy, which strengthens it, fuels growth, and ultimately lets businesses create the very jobs the unemployed have been looking for, for so long.

The people we are trying to help want to find work. They are trying to find work, and they would much rather get a paycheck than an unemployment check.

Nevadans such as Scott Headrick, who lost his job 2 years ago this month, and who has tried tirelessly to find a new one, is just one of millions who needs our help. Democrats are not going to turn our backs on him. He sends out resumes and goes to job interviews, but for months and months he has heard nothing but "no." What a shame it is that he is hearing the same from the Republicans in the Senate on this issue.

Mr. President, will the Chair announce the business for the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURING THE PROTECTION OF OUR ENDURING AND ESTABLISHED CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 460, H.R. 2765.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2765) to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments and certain foreign judgments against the providers of interactive computer services.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Securing the Protection of our Enduring and Established Constitutional Heritage Act" or the "SPEECH Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The freedom of speech and the press is enshrined in the first amendment to the Constitution, and is necessary to promote the vigorous dialogue necessary to shape public policy in a representative democracy.

(2) Some persons are obstructing the free expression rights of United States authors and publishers, and in turn chilling the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States interest of the citizenry in receiving information on matters of importance, by seeking out foreign jurisdictions that do not provide the full extent of free-speech protections to authors and publishers that are available in the United States, and suing a United States author or publisher in that foreign jurisdiction.

(3) These foreign defamation lawsuits not only suppress the free speech rights of the defendants to the suit, but inhibit other written speech that might otherwise have been written or published but for the fear of a foreign lawsuit.

(4) The threat of the libel laws of some foreign countries is so dramatic that the United Nations Human Rights Committee examined the issue and indicated that in some instances the law of libel has served to discourage critical media reporting on matters of serious public interest, adversely affecting the ability of scholars and journalists to publish their work. The advent of the internet and the international distribution of foreign media also create the danger that one country's unduly restrictive libel law will affect freedom of expression worldwide on matters of valid public interest.

(5) Governments and courts of foreign countries scattered around the world have failed to curtail this practice of permitting libel lawsuits against United States persons within their courts, and foreign libel judgments inconsistent with United States first amendment protections are increasingly common.

SEC. 3. RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN DEFAMATION JUDGMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VI of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"CHAPTER 181—FOREIGN JUDGMENTS

"Sec.

"4101. Definitions.

"4102. Recognition of foreign defamation judgments.

"4103. Removal.

"4104. Declaratory judgments.

"4105. Attorney's fees.